

## REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 7, 11 and 15 are the independent claims. Claims 11-18 are new. In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the application.

### The Claims Satisfy 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claims 7-10 have been amended to refer to “resources,” rather than “assets.” The term “resources” has clear support in the specification. *See, e.g.*, page 4, lines 5-8 and lines 28-31. Applicant respectfully suggests that the Examiner’s rejection of claims 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 should be withdrawn.

### The Claims Patentably Define The Invention Over Shorter.

Claims 1-6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,969,092 to Shorter (“Shorter”). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because *Shorter* fails to teach or suggest all the features of the recited claims.

Claim 1 recites a method for controlling access to network resources, comprising, “*providing the network resource with the identity of the network node in place of the identity of the user.*” *Shorter* fails to disclose the claimed feature. Instead, *Shorter* merely explains how an IBM VM host operating system may allocate a virtual machine to execute an application program on behalf of a user, while retaining the user’s identity. Indeed, *Shorter* provides an example at column 12:31-48 where a user invokes a Mail program within the allocated virtual machine. At no point does the operating system in *Shorter* permit the user to access network resources using only a network node identity. Rather, the operating system code uses the virtual machine to activate the mail program and then switches the ID of the virtual machine to the ID of the user. Thus, instead of accessing resources as if the user had a network node identity, *Shorter*’s operating system continues to make use of the user’s actual identity. For at least this reason, independent claim 1 is patentable over *Shorter* and should be allowed.

Claim 2 recites a method for providing authorized access to a network resource, comprising, “*assigning the first user the identity of the preauthorized machine.*” The Office

Action asserts that this feature is met by *Shorter* at column 12:11-65. Respectfully, this is incorrect. *Shorter* does not assign the first user the identity of the preauthorized machine. Instead, *Shorter* merely records the identity of the user to whom a new virtual machine has been allocated. See column 12:31-48. Furthermore, *Shorter* maintains the separate identity of the user throughout execution of the user's selected application program. *Id.* Nowhere does *Shorter* use the identity of a preauthorized machine in place of the identity of the user. Independent claim 2 is this patentable over *Shorter* and should be allowed. Claims 3-6, which depend from claim 2, are also patentable.

**New Claims Patentably Define The Invention Over Shorter.**

New claims 11-14 recite a method for accessing a network resource on the Internet, comprising, "assigning to the user the identity of the stateful virtual identity machine, and accessing the network resource using the assigned identity." Because *Shorter* does not teach or suggest this feature, the Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 11-14 are patentable over *Shorter* and should be allowed.

New claims 15-18 recite a set of instructions to implement a method for accessing a network resource on the Internet, comprising, "accessing the network resource on behalf of the user, using the identity of the network node." Because *Shorter* does not teach or suggest this feature, the Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 15-18 are patentable over *Shorter* and should be allowed.

## Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance. A timely Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (202) 220-4200 to discuss any aspect of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON

Date: Aug 28, 2003

By:   
Clyde E. Findley (Reg. No. 50,724)  
(Attorneys for Intel Corporation)

KENYON & KENYON  
1500 K Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20005  
Phone: (202) 220-4200

466733\_1.DOC